

without the burden of medically unnecessary restrictions.

Now more than ever, we need to protect this fundamental right. Nearly 50 years after the Supreme Court guaranteed the right to safe and legal abortion in *Roe v. Wade*, reproductive rights are under direct attack.

States are introducing laws at an alarming rate that seek to dramatically limit or outright ban abortion access. Some of these restrictive laws ban abortion after the 6th week of pregnancy, before many people know they are pregnant.

Even more concerning, we may no longer be able to rely on the Supreme Court to protect reproductive rights. The Supreme Court recently finished hearing oral arguments in a case about Mississippi's restrictive abortion law. Many Americans, including myself, are worried that the Supreme Court could significantly diminish or altogether overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

The repercussions of such a decision would be devastating. According to the Guttmacher Institute, more than half of U.S. States are poised to ban or severely restrict abortion access if this landmark decision is overturned. I remember what it was like prior to *Roe v. Wade*. I understand the heart-breaking and often unsafe situations that pregnant individuals face.

We must respond by passing the Women's Health Protection Act. Congress must do everything it can to ensure that individuals are able to access critical medical care and make the best decisions possible for their health. I am proud to cosponsor this important bill, and I won't stop fighting to protect fundamental reproductive rights.●

#### THE WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. KING. Madam President, I voted to proceed to the consideration of the Women's Health Protection Act today with some reluctance, not because of any doubts about the substance of the bill—I have been a strong supporter of reproductive choice throughout my public life—but because of concern about and disagreement with some of the provisions of its introductory "Findings" section.

Several of these provisions assert that opposition to reproductive services, including abortion, is rooted in racism and misogyny. I don't believe that this is true, and I do believe that it is unfair and insulting to the millions of Americans whose opposition to abortion is rooted in their faith and deeply held moral principles. While I disagree with their conclusion—that it is appropriate for the government to impose these beliefs on others who do not share them and thereby intrude into the personal medical choices of all women—I don't question their motives and strongly disagree with the language of the bill that does so.

My vote today was not a vote on the final passage of the bill, but only to

bring it to the Senate floor for debate and amendment. Had the motion succeeded, I, along with many of my colleagues, would have voted to remove this inflammatory and unnecessary language from the bill.

Fundamentally, this issue is about who should have the power to make this most personal and difficult choice, the government or individual women in consultation with their doctors. While respecting the motives of those who disagree, I think that power should rest with the woman.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Ms. SINEMA. Madam President, I strongly believe a woman's healthcare decisions should be between her, her doctor, and her family, which is why I voted to advance today's bill. If it advanced, I would have offered an amendment to remove editorial language that has no legislative effect and needlessly disparages everyday Americans based on their deeply and sincerely held beliefs. On issues so important and personal to many Americans, both parties should seek respectful understanding instead of ascribing motives or insulting those who hold different beliefs.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President; today, I voted that the Senate should proceed to consider H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act, which would codify in Federal law the privacy of women's reproductive healthcare established by the Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision.

I support the privacy of women's healthcare, codification of *Roe v. Wade*, and proceeding to consideration of this measure. Should the Senate proceed, however, nonbinding commentary in the bill's preamble as currently drafted wrongly and unfairly impugns the motives and integrity of fellow Americans who view this issue differently.

I represent a State with a broad diversity of views, and I respect that diversity. I respect the opinions of my constituents even when I do not share them, and I recognize that good people may arrive at different opinions in good faith.

So should the Senate proceed to consider this measure, as I will vote that it should, it must remove from the preamble to this bill divisive rhetoric that wrongly accuses Georgians who hold a different view than mine of having views rooted in misogyny. In a country so politically polarized and divided, we must recommit to tolerance and mutual respect.

#### ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Con-

trol Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 22-15, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$122 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,  
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22-15

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:  
Major Defense Equipment\* \$34 million.  
Other \$88 million.  
Total \$122 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Australia has requested the possible sale of AN/AAQ 24(V)N Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRC) component systems required to support an ongoing upgrade of its large Air Mobility Platforms, which include C-17As, KC-30As, and C-130Js.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):  
Twenty-seven (27) AN/AAQ 24(V)N Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRC) System Processor Replacements (LSPR) (27 installed, 0 spares).

Thirty (30) Guardian Laser Turret Assemblies (GLTA) (30 installed, 0 spares).

Non-MDE: Also included are LAIRC Control Indicator Unit Replacements (CIURs); Advanced Threat Missile Warning Sensors (ATWs); Smart Card Assemblies (SCAs); High Capacity Cards/User Data Memory Cards (HCCs/UDMs) (installed and spares); Simple Key Loaders; initial spares, consumables, and repair/return support; support and test equipment; integration and test support; personnel training, publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.